

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application, and claims 6-19 and 22-24 have been withdrawn. Claims 1 and 21 are independent claims, and claims 1 and 20 have been amended. Claims 2-4 and 20 have been cancelled, and claim 25 has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Drawings

Applicants note that the Examiner has not indicated whether the drawings filed on February 25, 2007 are acceptable, and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner do so in the next Office Action.

Foreign Priority Documents

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that certified copies of all priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau pursuant to PCT Rule 17.2(a).

Information Disclosure Statements

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's initialing of all references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement dated February 25, 2007.

Claim Objections

Claim 5 is objected to because of informalities. Specifically, the Examiner points out that claim 5 lacks antecedent basis for the stator part and the secondary part, and Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 1 provide the requisite antecedent basis. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claim 5 be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants have added claim 25 to the application. Applicants submit that this claim is supported by the disclosure and that no new matter has been introduced.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 – ROSS et al.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,307,766 (“Ross”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In FIG. 1, *Ross* allegedly teaches a contactless power system 10 including a primary conductor 20 that powers a secondary conductor 30 via induction. Primary conductor 20 is said to contain a power supply in the form of an amplifier 21 that is connected in parallel with three capacitors 22, 23, 24, which are all allegedly connected to a common terminal 25. Amplifier 21 is also said to be connected in parallel with three switches 26, 27, 28, which are allegedly selectively closed and opened by a controller 40. A capacitor 29 is said to be connected at the output of switches 26-28 and in series with primary transformer winding 50, which allegedly serves to transfer power from amplifier 21 to secondary conductor 30. Secondary conductor 30 is said to contain three switches, 32, 33, 34 which are allegedly connected in parallel with a three-phase motor 31 on one side, and secondary transforming winding 50" at their input. Switches 32, 33, 34 are said to be selectively closed and opened by a controller 60. Three capacitors 35, 36, 37, are also said to be connected in parallel with motor 31, and to a common terminal 38. (*Ross*, col. 3, lines 8-30).

Ross also allegedly teaches the operation of the contactless power system 10, where controller 40 allegedly opens and closes switches 22, 23, 24 serially to create pulses of power from amplifier 21, and these pulses are said to travel through transformer primary winding 50' to motor 31, via switches 32, 33, 34, which are allegedly closed and opened by controller 60 according to the pulses from amplifier 21. In this manner, power is allegedly transferred to motor 31 inductively, and without the need of wires to connect amplifier 21 and motor 31. (*Ross*, col. 3, lines 31-38).

The Examiner asserts transformer primary winding 50', secondary transforming winding 50" and the inductive transfer of power to motor 31 anticipate claim 1. Applicant submit that, because *Ross* fails to teach or suggest “a three-phase motor that includes a stator with three-phase windings and a secondary part with three-phase windings” and “wherein the three-phase windings of the stator and the three-phase windings of the secondary part are connected in a star

configuration” as recited by claim 1, *Ross* cannot be used as the basis of an anticipation rejection of claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – *ROSS et al.* in view of *FUJITA et al.*

Claims 2 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,307,766 (“*Ross*”) in view of JP 03007002 (“*Fujita*”). Applicants note that the cancellation of claim 2 renders its rejection moot, and respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 21.

The Examiner asserts that *Ross* teaches all aspects of claim 21, with the exception of “wherein the stator and the secondary part respectively have three-phase windings with the same number of pole pairs and with the same pole pitch.” (*Office Action*, page 3). The Examiner relies upon *Fujita* to cure this deficiency.

Fujita allegedly teaches a carrier driven by a linear motor wherein a carrier moving body 1 is moved using a magnetic function between a linear motor 8 and a secondary conductor 4 at the side of the carrier moving body 1. An electromotive force is said to be induced in the induction coil 9 through electromagnetic induction between a specific linear motor 8A and the induction coil 9 if the specific linear motor body 8a facing the induction coil 9 at the side of the carrier body 1 is excited when the carrier moving body 1 stops at an unloading position, allegedly feeding induced power to motor 3. (*Fujita*, Constitution).

Applicants submit *Fujita* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Ross* with respect to claim 1 as discussed above, because *Fujita* also fails to teach or suggest “a three-phase motor that includes a stator with three-phase windings and a secondary part with three-phase windings” and “wherein the three-phase windings of the stator and the three-phase windings of the secondary part are connected in a star configuration” as recited by claim 1. Applicants request the rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn, at least by virtue of its dependency upon claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – ROSS et al. in view of BALLANTYNE

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,307,766 (“Ross”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,635,560 (“Ballantyne”). Applicants submit that, in light of the cancellation of claim 3 in the amended claim set above, this rejection is moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – ROSS et al. in view of RICHERT et al.

Claims 4, 5 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,307,766 (“Ross”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,542,356 (“Richert”). Applicants This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants note that the cancellation of rejection of claims 4 and 20 render their rejection moot, and respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 5.

The Examiner alleges Ross teaches all aspects of claim 5, with the exception of “the data being modulated and being transmitted in the form of signals at a considerably higher frequency than the power supply system frequency” as recited in claim 5. To cure this deficiency, the Examiner cites Richert. (Office Action, pages 4-5).

Richert allegedly teaches a track-guided transport vehicle comprising an air cushion arrangement, an electrically driven compressor unit, and a motor drive. The motor drive is said to be a synchronous linear drive, with long stator and exciter part on the vehicle. The electrical energy for the compressor unit is allegedly inductively transferred to the winding of the linear drive by means of a higher frequency alternating current and a transformer effect. Richert allegedly further teaches that a long stator with individual stator sections is formed along the travel path, an exciter part with direct current powered exciter winding is provided on the transport vehicle itself, and a low frequency alternating current serves to generate a travelling field on the stator has a higher frequency alternating current superimposed thereon. Richert is said to teach that the higher frequency may be 10 times higher than the low frequency for the travelling field. (Richert, col. 1, lines 46-65).

Applicants submit Richert fails to cure the deficiencies of Ross with respect to claim 1 as discussed above, because Richert also fails to teach or suggest “a three-phase motor that includes a stator with three-phase windings and a secondary part with three-phase windings” and “wherein the three-phase windings of the stator and the three-phase windings of the secondary part are connected in a star configuration” as recited by claim 1. Therefore, Applicants request the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn, at least by virtue of its dependency upon claim 1.

CONCLUSION


In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Andrew D. Kasnevich at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
HARNES, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By


Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/ADK:krm
ADK